Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

Post Reply
Search this topic…
731 posts 1 … 26 27 28 29 30 … 49

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Wed Jan 15, 2025 10:08 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 6:35 pm
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 11:07 am
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 7:07 am
>>> Erroneous by what standard? Your own?
>>
>> Logic.
>>
>> You acknowledge multiples, acknowledge multiple distinctions, select only one then claim infinite is finite and not truly axiomatic because of that limited selection. You acknowledge multiplicity then conveniently exclude it to suit a biased position.
>
> My system is based upon the full range of paradoxes, should should know this by now.

You are not simply including all paradox but rather attempting to impose incongruent contradiction upon all things, hence the supposed relative nothingness in all things and the nonsensical assertions which result.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 6:37 pm
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 11:25 am
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 7:15 am
>>> Relative nothingness is an absence of a specific thing, considering all things are absent of specific other things relative nothingness permeates all things.
>>
>> Relative nothingness is nonsensical. A concept, a thing, but nonsensical.
>>
>> Absence of a thing is absence of a thing. Absence still concerns subjects and locations. Absence still concerns things. Absence itself is a condition, a thing.
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 7:15 am
>>> …considering all things are absent of specific other things relative nothingness permeates all things.
>>
>> That is a nonsensical statement.
>>
>> Things themselves are things. That is not absence of things or nothingness. Nor are other things magically nullified because of a particular thing. Other things are simply in other locations. They are. That is presence, not absence. Certainly not nothingness.
>>
>> Besides, all things are all things. There would be no absence of specific other things as it's *all things*.
>
> The absence of a specific thing within another thing occurs through every single thing. Occurring through every single thing, relative nothingness permeates all things.

A specific thing is a specific thing. A specific thing is not absent a specific thing as it *is* a specific thing.

You are selecting a single thing, at the exclusion of all other existence, and claiming that single thing is absent a thing. From that limited premise you are claiming existence is limited and only limited. It is a limited and erroneous position. Such is the basis of your argument.

All things are not absent other things. All things are *all things*.

Infinite remains infinite although finite things are. Infinite is inclusive. Infinite includes finite. Such is evident in the term itself. This is further explained here: viewtopic.php?p=747484#p747484

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 10:08 am
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 6:35 pm
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 11:07 am
>>>
>>> Logic.
>>>
>>> You acknowledge multiples, acknowledge multiple distinctions, select only one then claim infinite is finite and not truly axiomatic because of that limited selection. You acknowledge multiplicity then conveniently exclude it to suit a biased position.
>>
>> My system is based upon the full range of paradoxes, should should know this by now.
>
> You are not simply including all paradox but rather attempting to impose incongruent contradiction upon all things, hence the supposed relative nothingness in all things and the nonsensical assertions which result.
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 6:37 pm
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 05, 2025 11:25 am
>>>
>>> Relative nothingness is nonsensical. A concept, a thing, but nonsensical.
>>>
>>> Absence of a thing is absence of a thing. Absence still concerns subjects and locations. Absence still concerns things. Absence itself is a condition, a thing.
>>>
>>> That is a nonsensical statement.
>>>
>>> Things themselves are things. That is not absence of things or nothingness. Nor are other things magically nullified because of a particular thing. Other things are simply in other locations. They are. That is presence, not absence. Certainly not nothingness.
>>>
>>> Besides, all things are all things. There would be no absence of specific other things as it's *all things*.
>>
>> The absence of a specific thing within another thing occurs through every single thing. Occurring through every single thing, relative nothingness permeates all things.
>
> A specific thing is a specific thing. A specific thing is not absent a specific thing as it *is* a specific thing.
>
> You are selecting a single thing, at the exclusion of all other existence, and claiming that single thing is absent a thing. From that limited premise you are claiming existence is limited and only limited. It is a limited and erroneous position. Such is the basis of your argument.
>
> All things are not absent other things. All things are *all things*.
>
> Infinite remains infinite although finite things are. Infinite is inclusive. Infinite includes finite. Such is evident in the term itself. This is further explained here: viewtopic.php?p=747484#p747484

No, I included all paradox as evidenced by circle paradox:

The space between the interior and exterior space of the circle is the circle itself. The circle simultaneously connects these opposing spaces (congruent) and seperates these opposing spaces (incongruent).

This can be relegated to another paradox, the point occurence paradox:

The seperation of points allows points to occur by allowing distinction. Incongruency.

The connection of points allows points to occur as contrast is a relationship. Congruency.

As to the rest. A thing is defined by what it is not. An apple is defined by not being an orange, not a vegetable, not a tree, etc. What a thing is not allows a thing to take the space of what it is. This absence of any one or more things is a relative nothingness, a relative absence of a specific type of thingness.

If absence is a thing than relative nothingness is a thing and you claimed nothingness cannot exist, but it does.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Wed Jan 15, 2025 8:28 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm
> No, I included all paradox as evidenced by circle paradox:

You are not simply including all paradox but rather attempting to impose the whimsicality of relative nothingness upon all things which is fallacious.

You claim a thing lacks another thing and from this premise introduce relative nothingness. However a thing is still a thing and all things, being all things, lack no thing rendering relative nothingness nonsensical.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm
> As to the rest. A thing is defined by what it is not. An apple is defined by not being an orange, not a vegetable, not a tree…

A thing is *an existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. That which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part, in some way.*

An apple is defined primarily by its perceived characteristics in comparison and in contrast with the perceived characteristics of other things.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm
> If absence is a thing than relative nothingness is a thing and you claimed nothingness cannot exist, but it does.

Absence is a thing, absence can be observed. A student is absent from class, for example. That is observed each day in classrooms around the world. Still only things, people, locations, etcetera, are involved. Not nothingness or nonexistence.

As stated earlier relative nothingness is a nonsensical concept. It is still a thing although nonsensical. So yes, relative nothingness is a thing. It is a nonsensical concept which doesn't actually apply. A nonsensical concept is a nonsensical concept. Not nothingness or nonexistence.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 8:28 pm
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm
>> No, I included all paradox as evidenced by circle paradox:
>
> You are not simply including all paradox but rather attempting to impose the whimsicality of relative nothingness upon all things which is fallacious.
>
> You claim a thing lacks another thing and from this premise introduce relative nothingness. However a thing is still a thing and all things, being all things, lack no thing rendering relative nothingness nonsensical.
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm
>> As to the rest. A thing is defined by what it is not. An apple is defined by not being an orange, not a vegetable, not a tree…
>
> A thing is *an existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. That which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part, in some way.*
>
> An apple is defined primarily by its perceived characteristics in comparison and in contrast with the perceived characteristics of other things.
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm
>> If absence is a thing than relative nothingness is a thing and you claimed nothingness cannot exist, but it does.
>
> Absence is a thing, absence can be observed. A student is absent from class, for example. That is observed each day in classrooms around the world. Still only things, people, locations, etcetera, are involved. Not nothingness or nonexistence.
>
> As stated earlier relative nothingness is a nonsensical concept. It is still a thing although nonsensical. So yes, relative nothingness is a thing. It is a nonsensical concept which doesn't actually apply. A nonsensical concept is a nonsensical concept. Not nothingness or nonexistence.

You are not attentive are you? You are quite convinced you have reality in a box, don't you?

If a chair exists than the absence of a tree being there, an absence of a table being there, an absence of "x" being there represents an absence of certain things being there. This is a relative no-thing, a relative nothingness. This relative absence is a thing thus a relative nothingness occurs.

Relative Nothingness is a thing, thus nothingness exists.

If a thing is relative to perception than a relative absence, as a thing, also occurs as part of perception. Relative nothingness can be observed, thus relative nothingness is a thing. Existence requires nothingness.

Absence is quite sensicle. Considering an infinite number of things occurs there is an infinite nothingness through which these things occur.

You say all that exist are things and that nothingness is non-existent, but nothingness is a thing that exists.

You cannot escape the full range of paradoxes by which reality occurs.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Thu Jan 16, 2025 2:34 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 8:28 pm
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm
>>> No, I included all paradox as evidenced by circle paradox:
>>
>> You are not simply including all paradox but rather attempting to impose the whimsicality of relative nothingness upon all things which is fallacious.
>>
>> You claim a thing lacks another thing and from this premise introduce relative nothingness. However a thing is still a thing and all things, being all things, lack no thing rendering relative nothingness nonsensical.
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm
>>> As to the rest. A thing is defined by what it is not. An apple is defined by not being an orange, not a vegetable, not a tree…
>>
>> A thing is *an existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. That which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part, in some way.*
>>
>> An apple is defined primarily by its perceived characteristics in comparison and in contrast with the perceived characteristics of other things.
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 6:10 pm
>>> If absence is a thing than relative nothingness is a thing and you claimed nothingness cannot exist, but it does.
>>
>> Absence is a thing, absence can be observed. A student is absent from class, for example. That is observed each day in classrooms around the world. Still only things, people, locations, etcetera, are involved. Not nothingness or nonexistence.
>>
>> As stated earlier relative nothingness is a nonsensical concept. It is still a thing although nonsensical. So yes, relative nothingness is a thing. It is a nonsensical concept which doesn't actually apply. A nonsensical concept is a nonsensical concept. Not nothingness or nonexistence.
>
> You are quite convinced you have reality in a box, don't you?

Existence is infinite. Existence is not confined to a box.

You attempt to limit existence. You select some single thing, excluding all others, and use that as excuse to introduce nothingness.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
> If a chair exists than the absence of a tree being there, an absence of a table being there, an absence of "x" being there represents an absence of certain things being there. This is a relative no-thing, a relative nothingness. This relative absence is a thing thus a relative nothingness occurs.

A chair is acknowledged. A chair is a thing. That is a thing, not nothingness. A certain thing, a chair, is there. That is not absence of a certain thing. That is presence of a certain thing.

That certain thing is limited as that certain thing. However nothingness is not introduced because existence is not limited to that certain thing.

Take the chair example. One observes a chair and realizes it as a certain thing. Within that same observation, often within view of a chair is a table, observed through peripheral vision. Perhaps even a tree in the window. Those things are observably there. That very example, that single observation illustrates the multiplicity, the vastness, the unlimitedness of existence.

Absence and nothingness are not the same. Absence is a circumstance or condition and can be observed. Bob's absence from class Tuesday was acknowledged or observed by students, for example. Still only things occupied the room, students, desks, air, etcetera. All people and items referenced, Bob, class, the students, etcetera, are things, are existence. Nothingness, nonexistence is not and cannot be to be observed or referenced.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
> Relative Nothingness is a thing, thus nothingness exists.

Relative nothingness is an oxymoron. A nonsensical concept as you ironically suggest. You introduced the terms earlier:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm
> 1. There is nothing to coexist with absolute nothing as there is absolutely nothing for existence to coexist with in the absolute sense. Absolute nothingness is a term which is paradoxical.
>
> 2. Nothingness as relative is merely potentiality as a means for existence to actualize through change inducing movement. An atom is 99.9999… percent empty. A simple point in geometry is also empty. The emptiness is void, nothingness.
>
> **There is absolute nothingness and relative nothingness.**

…basically suggesting volumes of nothingness. By your assertion watermelon with salt is less percent nothingness than watermelon without salt. No, all is existence, components have merely been shifted around and measured accordingly.

You are suggesting gradients of nothingness, various types of nothingness, absolute nothingness and relative nothingness, yet essentially negate your own position here in another thread:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Nov 26, 2024 5:36 pm
>
>> **godelian** wrote: ↑ Tue Nov 26, 2024 2:06 am
>> Yes, but there is still another problem with "nothing". Not a house is not the same as not a car or not a hamburger. Nothing has a type. The emptiness of a box of chocolates is not the same as the emptiness of an apartment.
>
> **If nothing is a type then it is not nothing**, to speak the word "nothing" is a contradiction.

You essentially concede types of nothingness to be nonsense. Further illustrating the absurdity of the concept. How can there be types of nothingness? How can there be gradients of nothingness? There can only be gradients of things. Things are not defined by what is not but by what is.

Relative nothingness is nonsensical. Nothingness is not and cannot be. To any degree.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Fri Jan 17, 2025 12:34 am

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 2:34 pm
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 15, 2025 8:28 pm
>>>
>>> You are not simply including all paradox but rather attempting to impose the whimsicality of relative nothingness upon all things which is fallacious.
>>>
>>> You claim a thing lacks another thing and from this premise introduce relative nothingness. However a thing is still a thing and all things, being all things, lack no thing rendering relative nothingness nonsensical.
>>>
>>> A thing is *an existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. That which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part, in some way.*
>>>
>>> An apple is defined primarily by its perceived characteristics in comparison and in contrast with the perceived characteristics of other things.
>>>
>>> Absence is a thing, absence can be observed. A student is absent from class, for example. That is observed each day in classrooms around the world. Still only things, people, locations, etcetera, are involved. Not nothingness or nonexistence.
>>>
>>> As stated earlier relative nothingness is a nonsensical concept. It is still a thing although nonsensical. So yes, relative nothingness is a thing. It is a nonsensical concept which doesn't actually apply. A nonsensical concept is a nonsensical concept. Not nothingness or nonexistence.
>>
>> You are quite convinced you have reality in a box, don't you?
>
> Existence is infinite. Existence is not confined to a box.
>
> You attempt to limit existence. You select some single thing, excluding all others, and use that as excuse to introduce nothingness.
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
>> If a chair exists than the absence of a tree being there, an absence of a table being there, an absence of "x" being there represents an absence of certain things being there. This is a relative no-thing, a relative nothingness. This relative absence is a thing thus a relative nothingness occurs.
>
> A chair is acknowledged. A chair is a thing. That is a thing, not nothingness. A certain thing, a chair, is there. That is not absence of a certain thing. That is presence of a certain thing.
>
> That certain thing is limited as that certain thing. However nothingness is not introduced because existence is not limited to that certain thing.
>
> Take the chair example. One observes a chair and realizes it as a certain thing. Within that same observation, often within view of a chair is a table, observed through peripheral vision. Perhaps even a tree in the window. Those things are observably there. That very example, that single observation illustrates the multiplicity, the vastness, the unlimitedness of existence.
>
> Absence and nothingness are not the same. Absence is a circumstance or condition and can be observed. Bob's absence from class Tuesday was acknowledged or observed by students, for example. Still only things occupied the room, students, desks, air, etcetera. All people and items referenced, Bob, class, the students, etcetera, are things, are existence. Nothingness, nonexistence is not and cannot be to be observed or referenced.
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
>> Relative Nothingness is a thing, thus nothingness exists.
>
> Relative nothingness is an oxymoron. A nonsensical concept as you ironically suggest. You introduced the terms earlier:
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm
>> 1. There is nothing to coexist with absolute nothing as there is absolutely nothing for existence to coexist with in the absolute sense. Absolute nothingness is a term which is paradoxical.
>>
>> 2. Nothingness as relative is merely potentiality as a means for existence to actualize through change inducing movement. An atom is 99.9999… percent empty. A simple point in geometry is also empty. The emptiness is void, nothingness.
>>
>> **There is absolute nothingness and relative nothingness.**
>
> …basically suggesting volumes of nothingness. By your assertion watermelon with salt is less percent nothingness than watermelon without salt. No, all is existence, components have merely been shifted around and measured accordingly.
>
> You are suggesting gradients of nothingness, various types of nothingness, absolute nothingness and relative nothingness, yet essentially negate your own position here in another thread:
>
>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Nov 26, 2024 5:36 pm
>>
>>> **godelian** wrote: ↑ Tue Nov 26, 2024 2:06 am
>>> Yes, but there is still another problem with "nothing". Not a house is not the same as not a car or not a hamburger. Nothing has a type. The emptiness of a box of chocolates is not the same as the emptiness of an apartment.
>>
>> **If nothing is a type then it is not nothing**, to speak the word "nothing" is a contradiction.
>
> You essentially concede types of nothingness to be nonsense. Further illustrating the absurdity of the concept. How can there be types of nothingness? How can there be gradients of nothingness? There can only be gradients of things. Things are not defined by what is not but by what is.
>
> Relative nothingness is nonsensical. Nothingness is not and cannot be. To any degree.

If a thing occurs through not being another thing than this absence is a relative no-thing.

Nothingness as absence is a thing, nothingness exists.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Fri Jan 17, 2025 2:26 am

Age
Posts: 26384
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 17, 2025 12:34 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 2:34 pm
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
>>>
>>> You are quite convinced you have reality in a box, don't you?
>>
>> Existence is infinite. Existence is not confined to a box.
>>
>> You attempt to limit existence. You select some single thing, excluding all others, and use that as excuse to introduce nothingness.
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
>>> If a chair exists than the absence of a tree being there, an absence of a table being there, an absence of "x" being there represents an absence of certain things being there. This is a relative no-thing, a relative nothingness. This relative absence is a thing thus a relative nothingness occurs.
>>
>> A chair is acknowledged. A chair is a thing. That is a thing, not nothingness. A certain thing, a chair, is there. That is not absence of a certain thing. That is presence of a certain thing.
>>
>> That certain thing is limited as that certain thing. However nothingness is not introduced because existence is not limited to that certain thing.
>>
>> Take the chair example. One observes a chair and realizes it as a certain thing. Within that same observation, often within view of a chair is a table, observed through peripheral vision. Perhaps even a tree in the window. Those things are observably there. That very example, that single observation illustrates the multiplicity, the vastness, the unlimitedness of existence.
>>
>> Absence and nothingness are not the same. Absence is a circumstance or condition and can be observed. Bob's absence from class Tuesday was acknowledged or observed by students, for example. Still only things occupied the room, students, desks, air, etcetera. All people and items referenced, Bob, class, the students, etcetera, are things, are existence. Nothingness, nonexistence is not and cannot be to be observed or referenced.
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
>>> Relative Nothingness is a thing, thus nothingness exists.
>>
>> Relative nothingness is an oxymoron. A nonsensical concept as you ironically suggest. You introduced the terms earlier:
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm
>>> 1. There is nothing to coexist with absolute nothing as there is absolutely nothing for existence to coexist with in the absolute sense. Absolute nothingness is a term which is paradoxical.
>>>
>>> 2. Nothingness as relative is merely potentiality as a means for existence to actualize through change inducing movement. An atom is 99.9999… percent empty. A simple point in geometry is also empty. The emptiness is void, nothingness.
>>>
>>> **There is absolute nothingness and relative nothingness.**
>>
>> …basically suggesting volumes of nothingness. By your assertion watermelon with salt is less percent nothingness than watermelon without salt. No, all is existence, components have merely been shifted around and measured accordingly.
>>
>> You are suggesting gradients of nothingness, various types of nothingness, absolute nothingness and relative nothingness, yet essentially negate your own position here in another thread:
>>
>>> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Nov 26, 2024 5:36 pm
>>>
>>> **If nothing is a type then it is not nothing**, to speak the word "nothing" is a contradiction.
>>
>> You essentially concede types of nothingness to be nonsense. Further illustrating the absurdity of the concept. How can there be types of nothingness? How can there be gradients of nothingness? There can only be gradients of things. Things are not defined by what is not but by what is.
>>
>> Relative nothingness is nonsensical. Nothingness is not and cannot be. To any degree.
>
> If a thing occurs through not being another thing than this absence is a relative no-thing.

If A thing occurs through not being another thing, then the first thing, is NOT absent, and therefore EXISTS. SO, there is NO absence, here, which MEANS that your claim of 'this absence' exists in your IMAGINATION ONLY, "eodnhoj7".

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 17, 2025 12:34 am
> Nothingness as absence is a thing, nothingness exists.

That there is a perceived ABSENCE between and around physical things IS OBVIOUS.

That the apparent 'nothing', or 'space', between and around physical things is KNOWN as 'something', and is IN FACT 'some thing' is PLAINLY OBVIOUS, AS WELL.

So, the areas of 'nothingness', IN this One and ONLY Universe, is, OBVIOUSLY, A 'thing'. And, so it could be said and argued that, OBVIOUSLY, 'nothingness' exists. But, JUST AS OBVIOUS is the IRREFUTABLE Fact that is NOT just ONLY 'nothingness'. That you BELIEVE, ABSOLUTELY, that there IS ONLY 'nothingness', ONLY, IS OBVIOUS, and that your words, here, are 'TRYING' their HARDEST to FIGHT and ARGUE FOR you BELIEF that there is ONLY 'nothingness' IS ALSO OBVIOUS, but 'those words' ARE False, and VERY, VERY Wrong, Inaccurate, AND Incorrect.

As I have, AGAIN, JUST PROVED True, ONCE MORE.

OF COURSE it could be SAID and ARGUED that 'nothingness' exists. The 'space' between and around 'matter' is A FORM OF 'nothingness'. 'Space', itself, HAS TO BE INTERPRETED and SEEN AS A 'nothingness'. Otherwise, the OTHER 'thing/s' could NOT be INTERPRETED, and SEEN. So, it is BLATANTLY OBVIOUS that 'nothingness' EXISTS. And, it is just AS BLATANTLY OBVIOUS that 'something/s' EXIST.

AGAIN, and for the VERY SLOW OF LEARNING and COMPREHENDING, and UNDERSTANDING, here;

The Universe, FUNDAMENTALLY, is made up of TWO 'things', namely 'matter', or 'something', AND, 'space', or 'nothing/no thing'.

Now, and AGAIN, they BOTH HAVE TO EXIST, otherwise if there was ONLY one of them, then there would NOT BE 'contrast', which is NEEDED TO DISCERN. If there was ONLY 'one', 'space' OR 'matter', ONLY, then the One who is the Observer, and who IS the 'I', which IS AWARE, could NOT be HERE, NOW. Since 'I' AM HERE, NOW, the Universe EXISTS, and HOW the Universe EXISTS IS BECAUSE, at the MOST FUNDAMENTAL LEVEL, 'what' EXISTS is BOTH 'visible' ['matter'], AND, 'invisible' ['space']. And, 'one' WITHOUT 'the other' 'I' could NOT be HERE-NOW, and, the Universe could NOT be FATHOMABLE. Let alone UNDERSTOOD, and KNOWN.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:25 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 17, 2025 12:34 am
> If a thing occurs through not being another thing than this absence is a relative no-thing.

The thing is a thing. That is a thing, not absence of a thing.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 17, 2025 12:34 am
> Nothingness as absence is a thing, nothingness exists.

Absence and nothingness are not the same. Absence is a circumstance or condition and can be observed. Bob's absence from class Tuesday was acknowledged or observed by students, for example. Still only things occupied the room, students, desks, books, air, etcetera. All people and items referenced, Bob, class, the students, etcetera, are things, are existence. Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing is not and cannot be to be observed or referenced.

Relative nothingness is nonsensical, it is contradictory. It is *relative* meaning it involves other things. Its own terminology implicitly acknowledges other things thus indicating no actual absence or lack.

Your own example illustrates this. The chair example, for instance. You claim relative nothingness because the chair is not a table. However in that very claim another thing, a table, is acknowledged as a point of identification for the chair. Other things are included thus they are not lacking. Relative nothingness negates itself.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:42 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 17, 2025 2:26 am
> The Universe, FUNDAMENTALLY, is made up of TWO 'things', namely 'matter', or 'something', AND, 'space', or 'nothing/no thing'.

Space and nothing are not synonymous.

The contrast of physicality is immateriality. Not nothing or nothingness.

Material is differentiated from immaterial. Both can be perceived and are perceived.

Immaterial space has no matter, no material composition thus no resistance allowing material bodies motion.

Immaterial space, things have properties, qualities or characteristics. Things, existence can be discussed. Nothing has no qualities or properties nor can it be discussed as it does not exist.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:30 pm

Age
Posts: 26384
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:42 pm
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 17, 2025 2:26 am
>> The Universe, FUNDAMENTALLY, is made up of TWO 'things', namely 'matter', or 'something', AND, 'space', or 'nothing/no thing'.
>
> Space and nothing are not synonymous.

OBVIOUSLY. you human beings have A MULTITUDE OF VERY DIFFERENT DEFINITIONS FOR the word 'space'.

However, let 'us' SEE IF 'you' can TELL 'us' what 'space' IS, EXACTLY?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:42 pm
> The contrast of physicality is immateriality.

OBVIOUSLY.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:42 pm
> Not nothing or nothingness.

Did 'i' SAY or MENTION ABSOLUTELY ANY thing AT ALL about 'The contrast of physicality is 'nothing' or 'nothingness'?

If yes, then WHERE, EXACTLY?

But if no, then WHY BRING UP and MENTION what you DID, here?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:42 pm
> Material is differentiated from immaterial.

OBVIOUSLY. BUT what has 'this' GOT TO DO WITH what you QUOTED me SAYING and WRITING above, here?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:42 pm
> Both can be perceived and are perceived.

SO WHAT?

And, by the way, what do you PERCEIVE IS 'immaterial'?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:42 pm
> Immaterial space has no matter, no material composition thus no resistance allowing material bodies motion.

Okay, if you say so.

But, how are you DEFINING the 'space' word, here, EXACTLY?

And, what is the ACTUAL DIFFERENCE between so-called 'material space' AND 'immaterial space', EXACTLY?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:42 pm
> Immaterial space, things have properties, qualities or characteristics.

BUT what IS 'space', itself, TO you, EXACTLY?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 12:42 pm
> Things, existence can be discussed. Nothing has no qualities or properties nor can it be discussed as it does not exist.

So, to "daniel j lavender" anyway, the WHOLE INFINITE Universe is made up of ONE, infinitely compressed, piece of material, or matter, ONLY. Or, in other words, OF ONE 'something', ALONE.

I WILL suggest that BEFORE you, or another, 'TRIES TO' ARGUE AGAINST what I have SAID and MEANT, they, FIRST, OBTAIN the KNOWLEDGE OF what I ACTUALLY MEANT, PRIOR to SPEAKING and/or WRITING.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:51 pm

Age
Posts: 26384
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

Obviously the Universe, Itself, is NOT just ONE SOLID 'piece of matter'. Which therefore MEANS there IS EXISTING a 'distance', or a 'space' between and around 'matter', at the smallest of perspectives or levels, and at the largest of perspectives or levels, for example, there is a distance or space between 'quarks' and 'leptons', as well as between and around 'stars' and 'galaxies'.

Now, this space, or distance, can be said or can be called an area of 'nothing', however, and obviously, 'this area of nothing' is ALSO A 'something'. It is JUST an area of apparent 'nothing' or 'no thing', which is in CONTRAST of an area of 'obvious matter'. But, and OBVIOUSLY, BOTH HAVE TO EXIST, or CO-EXIST WITH 'each other', FOR the Universe to BE 'the way' that It IS.

And, BECAUSE the Universe IS IN 'this way' HERE-NOW, then the Universe HAS TO BE IN 'this way' ALWAYS, or ETERNALLY.

Which, like WITH ALL of what I SAY and CLAIM, here, CAN BE and WILL BE PROVED, IRREFUTABLY, True, that is; IF absolutely ANY one IS Truly INTERESTED IN HAVING A FULLY OPEN and Honest DISCUSSION, here.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sat Jan 18, 2025 4:59 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:30 pm
> However, let 'us' SEE IF 'you' can TELL 'us' what 'space' IS, EXACTLY?
>
> …But, how are you DEFINING the 'space' word, here, EXACTLY?

Space is volume, area or a region of existence.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:30 pm
> And, what is the ACTUAL DIFFERENCE between so-called 'material space' AND 'immaterial space', EXACTLY?

We have already discussed this topic:

viewtopic.php?p=653105#p653105

viewtopic.php?p=653553#p653553

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:30 pm
> So, to "daniel j lavender" anyway, the WHOLE INFINITE Universe…

The universe is not necessarily infinite. Existence encompasses the universe. Existence is the more comprehensive term.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:30 pm
> So, to "daniel j lavender" anyway, the WHOLE INFINITE Universe is made up of ONE, infinitely compressed, piece of material, or matter, ONLY. Or, in other words, OF ONE 'something', ALONE.

No. There are various elements, various components. All components, all elements are parts of existence.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sat Jan 18, 2025 5:40 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:51 pm
> Obviously the Universe, Itself, is NOT just ONE SOLID 'piece of matter'. Which therefore MEANS there IS EXISTING a 'distance', or a 'space' between and around 'matter', at the smallest of perspectives or levels, and at the largest of perspectives or levels, for example, there is a distance or space between 'quarks' and 'leptons', as well as between and around 'stars' and 'galaxies'.
>
> Now, this space, or distance, can be said or can be called an area of 'nothing', however, and obviously, **'this area of nothing' is ALSO A 'something'. It is JUST an area of apparent 'nothing' or 'no thing'**, which is in CONTRAST of an area of 'obvious matter'. But, and OBVIOUSLY, BOTH HAVE TO EXIST, or CO-EXIST WITH 'each other', FOR the Universe to BE 'the way' that It IS.
>
> And, BECAUSE the Universe IS IN 'this way' HERE-NOW, then the Universe HAS TO BE IN 'this way' ALWAYS, or ETERNALLY.
>
> Which, like WITH ALL of what I SAY and CLAIM, here, CAN BE and WILL BE PROVED, IRREFUTABLY, True, that is; IF absolutely ANY one IS Truly INTERESTED IN HAVING A FULLY OPEN and Honest DISCUSSION, here.

Something, some thing is a thing. A thing is not no thing. Your contention is a contradiction.

As stated in July of 2023 "area of nothing" is an oxymoron:

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am
> "Area of nothing" is an oxymoron.
>
> If it is an area it is *not* nothing. The area may be considered empty (as in free of matter) however it would *not* be nothingness.

The contrast of matter, of materiality is immateriality. Not nothingness.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Sun Jan 19, 2025 12:11 am

Age
Posts: 26384
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 4:59 pm
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:30 pm
>> However, let 'us' SEE IF 'you' can TELL 'us' what 'space' IS, EXACTLY?
>>
>> …But, how are you DEFINING the 'space' word, here, EXACTLY?
>
> Space is volume, area or a region of existence.

Okay. And, what does this 'space', [volume, area, or a region of existence], consist of, exactly, and/or made up of, EXACTLY?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 4:59 pm
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:30 pm
>> And, what is the ACTUAL DIFFERENCE between so-called 'material space' AND 'immaterial space', EXACTLY?
>
> We have already discussed this topic:
>
> viewtopic.php?p=653105#p653105
>
> viewtopic.php?p=653553#p653553

Okay. So, if 'we' have ALREADY DISCUSSED 'this topic', then what have I ALREADY CONCLUDED, and what are my VIEWS, here, exactly?

Now, if you do NOT YET ALREADY KNOW mine, and you can NOT REPEAT my VIEWS, here, then WHY DO you EXPECT me to KNOW yours, ALREADY?

If you do NOT WISH to JUST SAY what your CONCLUDED VIEWS ARE, here, then okay.

Also, and by the way, you may NOT YET HAVE NOTICED but what 'we' HAD ALREADY DISCUSSED, in those links what NOT 'material space' NOR 'immaterial space' AT ALL. What 'we' ACTUALLY DISCUSSED, in those posts, was 'immaterial expanse', INSTEAD.

So, would you 'now' like to INFORM the readers, here, ABOUT the ACTUAL DIFFERENCE between so-called 'material space' AND 'immaterial space', EXACTLY?

If no, then WHY NOT?

But, if yes, then GREAT.

After all I will AGAIN suggest that if one wants to INTRODUCE 'ideas' or 'terms', then it is BETTER FOR them that they have the ACTUAL PROOF or the ABILITY TO back up and support 'their ideas' and/or 'their terms'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 4:59 pm
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Jan 18, 2025 1:30 pm
>> So, to "daniel j lavender" anyway, the WHOLE INFINITE Universe…
>
> The universe is not necessarily infinite.

LOL

To me, this would have been like STATING and CLAIMING that the earth does not necessarily revolve around the sun, TO the one who is EXPLAINING HOW the earth does ACTUALLY revolve around the sun.

ONCE AGAIN, for the SLOW OF LEARNING and/or for those who are NOT LISTENING. **The Universe IS infinite AND eternal**, FULL STOP.